

APR 03 2002



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Cheryl L. Gastineau
REED SMITH SHAW & MCCLAY LLP
435 Sixth Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1886

In re Application of	:	
IYER et al.	:	
Application No.: 09/581,122	:	DECISION ON PETITION
PCT No.: PCT/US98/12394	:	UNDER 37 CFR 1.47(a)
Int. Filing: 15 June 1998	:	
Priority Date: 17 June 1997	:	
Attorney Docket No.: 98-503-W0	:	
For: FETAL OXIMETRY SYSTEM AND	:	
SENSOR	:	

This is a response to applicants' "Renewed Petition Under 37 CFR 1.47(a)" filed 14 January 2002 to accept the application without the signatures of joint inventors, Robert M. Johnson, Johannes Buschmann, Reinhold Falkowski, and Nick Tu and communication filed via facsimile on 14 February 2002.

BACKGROUND

On 15 June 1998, applicants filed international application PCT/US98/12394, which designated the United States. A Demand for international preliminary examination electing the United States was filed prior to the expiration of 19 months from the priority date. Accordingly, the thirty-month period for paying the basic national fee in the United States expired at midnight on 17 December 1999.

On 20 December 1999, applicant filed a transmittal for entry into the national stage in the United States, which accompanied by, inter alia: the requisite basic national fee as required by 35 U.S.C. 371(c)(1) and a petition to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(b). The petition to revive was granted in a decision dated 16 August 2000.

On 12 February 2001, the United States Designated/Elected Office mailed a Notification of Missing Requirements under 35 U.S.C. 371 (Form PCT/DO/EO/905) indicating that an oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.497(a) and (b) must be filed. The notification set a one-month time limit in which to respond.

On 11 June 2001, applicant filed the petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) and a petition for a four-month extension of time. The petition was dismissed in a decision dated 12 September 2001.

On 14 January 2002, applicant filed the present renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a). The renewed petition was accompanied by: a declaration executed by the previous non-signing, inventor Clifford G. Montagnoli; a declaration executed by the previous non-

signing inventor, Steven R. Smith; and declaration of Cheryl Gastineau.

DISCUSSION

A petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) must be accompanied by (1) the fee under 37 CFR 1.17(h), (2) factual proof that the missing joint inventor refuses to execute the application or cannot be reached after diligent effort, (3) a statement of the last known address of the missing inventor, and (4) an oath or declaration by each 37 CFR 1.47(a) applicant on his or her own behalf and behalf of the non-signing joint inventor. Items (1), (3) and (4) have been satisfied.

Regarding item (2) above, Section 409.03(d) of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.), **Proof of Unavailability or Refusal**, states, in part:

Where inability to find or reach a nonsigning inventor "after diligent effort" is the reason for filing under 37 CFR 1.47, an affidavit or declaration of facts should be submitted that fully describes the exact facts which are relied on to establish that a diligent effort was made.

The fact that a nonsigning inventor is on vacation or out of town and is therefore temporarily unavailable to sign the declaration is not an acceptable reason for filing under 37 CFR 1.47. Such a petition will be dismissed as inappropriate.

The affidavit or declaration of facts must be signed, where at all possible, by a person having firsthand knowledge of the facts recited therein. Statements based on hearsay will not normally be accepted. Copies of documentary evidence such as certified mail return receipt, cover letter of instructions, telegrams, etc., that support a finding that the nonsigning inventor could not be found or reached should be made part of the affidavit or declaration. It is important that the affidavit or declaration contain statements of fact as opposed to conclusions.

Where a refusal of the inventor to sign the application papers is alleged, the circumstances of this refusal must be specified in an affidavit or declaration by the person to whom the refusal was made. Statements by a party not present when an oral refusal is made will not be accepted.

a. **Inventor Robert M. Johnson**

A review of the present petition reveal that applicants have not provided an acceptable showing that a diligent effort was made to reach the non-signing inventor, Robert M. Johnson. Petitioner has provided a copy of the cover letter addressed to Mr. Johnson mailed 24 September 2001 by Express Mail. The Express Mail label, provided by the petitioner, is stamped by the United States Postal Service as "undeliverable." Were any other attempts made to located Mr. Johnson? The single mailing of the papers to the non-signing inventor's last known address does not constitute a "diligent" effort to locate the

inventor. Applicant must show that alternative means were employed, such as a search of telephone and/or Internet directories, in an attempt to locate Mr. Johnson.

b. Inventor Johannes Buschmann

A review of the present petition reveal that applicants have not provided an acceptable showing that a diligent effort was made to reach the non-signing inventor, Johannes Buschmann. Petitioner has provided a copy of the cover letter addressed to Mr. Buschmann mailed 24 September 2001, however, petitioner does not provide documentary evidence to support the failed attempts. Was the DHL letter(s) returned as undeliverable? Was the letter(s) received by Mr. Buschmann or by someone at the last known address? The single mailing of the papers to the non-signing inventor's last known address does not constitute a "diligent" effort to locate the inventor. Applicant must show that alternative means were employed, such as a search of telephone and/or Internet directories, in an attempt to locate Mr. Buschmann.

c. Inventor Reinhold Falkowski

A review of the present petition reveal that applicants have not provided an acceptable showing that a diligent effort was made to reach the non-signing inventor, Reinhold Falkowski. Petitioner has provided a copy of the cover letter addressed to Mr. Falkowski mailed 24 September 2001, however, petitioner does not provide documentary evidence to support the failed attempts. Was the DHL letter(s) returned as undeliverable? Was the letter(s) received by Mr. Falkowski or by someone at the last known address? The single mailing of the papers to the non-signing inventor's last known address does not constitute a "diligent" effort to locate the inventor. Applicant must show that alternative means were employed, such as a search of telephone and/or Internet directories, in an attempt to locate Mr. Falkowski.

d. Inventor Nick Tu

A review of the present petition reveal that applicants have not provided an acceptable showing that a diligent effort was made to reach the non-signing inventor, Nick Tu. Petitioner has provided a copy of the cover letter addressed to Mr. Johnson mailed 24 September 2001 by Express Mail. The Express Mail Label, provided by the petitioner, is stamped by the United States Postal Service as "undeliverable." Were any other attempts made to located Mr. Tu? The single mailing of the papers to the non-signing inventor's last known address does not constitute a "diligent" effort to locate the inventor. Applicant must show that alternative means were employed, such as a search of telephone and/or Internet directories, in an attempt to locate Mr. Tu.

In order to meet the requirements of 37 CFR 1.47(a) and Section 409.03(d) of the MPEP, a statement of facts is needed from a person having first hand knowledge of the facts that a complete copy of the application papers was sent to Robert M. Johnson, Johannes Buschmann, Reinhold Falkowski, and Nick Tu, and when such papers were sent. In addition, copies of documentary evidence such as a certified mail return receipt, cover letter of instruction, telegrams, etc., should be supplied with the declaration.

For the above reasons, it would not be appropriate to accept this application without the signature of Robert M. Johnson, Johannes Buschmann, Reinhold Falkowski, and Nick Tu at this time.

CONCLUSION

The renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

If reconsideration on the merits of this petition is desired, a proper response must be filed within **TWO (2) MONTH** from the mail date of this decision. Any reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition Under 37 CFR 1.47(a)." No additional petition fee is required.

Any further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Box PCT, Washington, D.C. 20231, with the contents of the letter marked to the attention to the PCT Legal Office.



Richard Cole
PCT Legal Examiner
PCT Legal Office



Anthony Smith
Attorney-Advisor
PCT Legal Office
Tel.: 703-308-6314
Facsimile: 703-308-6459